

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-4 are now present in the application. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Anandan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0007517. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites "a phase transforming film disposed above the organic light-emitting diode layer and having a retardation state of a quarter-wave phase difference that can be converted to have a retardation state with zero phase difference". Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, the Examiner referred to Anandan's LCD 31 in FIG. 3 as the phase transforming film and alleged that Anandan in paragraphs 0033 and 0034 discloses that the LCD has a retardation state of a quarter-wave phase difference that can be converted to have a retardation state with zero phase difference as recited in claim 1. However, after reviewing paragraphs 0033 and 0034 of Anandan, Applicants did not find that Anandan discloses that the LCD has the above-noted features as recited in claim 1 such as the quarter-wave phase difference. Therefore, Anandan fails to teach "a phase transforming film disposed above the organic light-emitting diode layer and having a retardation state of a quarter-wave phase difference that can be converted to have a retardation state with zero phase difference" as recited in claim 1.

Applicants also respectfully submit that, unlike Anandan, the present invention does not need to manufacture the internal polarizer. In addition, the conventional retardation film with high molecules reduces the lift span of the product due to its bad moisture-resistance.

Since Anandan fails to teach each and every limitation of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of Anandan. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$120.00 is attached herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

